

Section M - Evaluation Factors for Award

TABLE OF CONTENTS

M.1 DOE-M-1004 Compliance with the Request for Proposal..... 2
M.2 EMCBC-M-1002 Proposal Evaluation - General..... 2
M.3 EMCBC-M-1003 Basis for Award..... 2
M.4 EMCBC-M-1004 Technical Evaluation 3
M.5 EMCBC-M-1005 Cost Evaluation 5

Section M - Evaluation Factors for Award

M.1 DOE-M-1004 Compliance with the Request for Proposal

The Offeror's compliance with the proposal instructions as outlined in OFFER AND OTHER DOCUMENTS (such as format and content) will be evaluated.

M.2 EMCBC-M-1002 Proposal Evaluation - General

(a) This acquisition will be conducted pursuant to the policies and procedures in Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) Part 15 and Department of Energy Acquisition Regulation (DEAR) Part 915. In accordance with FAR Subpart 15.3, Source Selection, a Source Evaluation Board (SEB) has been established to evaluate proposals submitted for this acquisition. The findings will be presented to the Source Selection Official who will consider the recommendations and select the source or sources whose proposal is the best value to the Government.

(b) The instructions set forth in Section L of this Request for Proposal (RFP) are designed to provide guidance to the Offeror concerning the documentation that will be evaluated by the SEB. The Offeror must furnish specific information in its response to adequately address the evaluation criteria. cursory responses that merely repeat or reformulate the Performance Work Statement are not acceptable.

(c) A proposal will be eliminated from further consideration before the evaluation if the proposal is so grossly and obviously deficient as to be totally unacceptable on its face. For example, a proposal will be deemed unacceptable if it does not represent a reasonable effort to address itself to the essential requirements of the RFP, or if it clearly demonstrates the Offeror does not understand the requirements of the RFP. In the event that a proposal is rejected, a proposal will not be considered for further evaluation under this solicitation.

(d) Any exceptions or deviations to the terms of the solicitation may make the offer unacceptable for award. If an Offeror proposes exceptions to the terms and conditions of the contract, the Government may make an award without discussions to another Offeror that did not take exception to the terms and conditions of the solicitation.

(e) A proposal deficient in any evaluation factor will not be selected for award.

(f) In accordance with Section L Provision 52.215-1, Instruction to Offerors – Competitive Acquisition, DOE intends to evaluate proposals and award a contract without discussions with Offerors (except clarifications as described in FAR 15.306(a)). Therefore, the Offeror's initial proposal should contain the Offeror's best terms from both a technical and cost standpoint. The Government reserves the right to seek information clarifying any element of an offer prior to award without discussions. DOE reserves the right to conduct discussions if the Contracting Officer later determines them to be necessary.

(g) If a competitive range is established pursuant to FAR 15.306(c), the Contracting Officer may limit the number of proposals in the competitive range to the greatest number that will permit an efficient competition among the most highly rated proposals.

M.3 EMCBC-M-1003 Basis for Award

DOE intends to award one (1) contract to the responsible Offeror whose proposal is responsive to the solicitation and determined to be the best value to the Government. However, the Government reserves the right to make any number of awards, or no award, if considered to be in the Government's best interest to do so. Selection of the best value to the Government will be achieved through a process of evaluating the strengths, weaknesses, and deficiencies, of each Offeror's technical proposal against the Evaluation Criteria described in Section M and listed below:

- Criterion 1 – Relevant Experience
- Criterion 2 - Technical and Management Approach (Sample Task)
- Criterion 3 – Key Personnel, Organization and Staffing
- Criterion 4 – Relevant Past Performance

In determining the best value to the Government, all evaluation criteria, other than cost or price, when combined, are significantly more important than the total evaluated cost or price and the evaluated fee ceiling(s) as described below. The Government is more concerned with obtaining a superior technical proposal than making an award at the lowest evaluated price. However, the Government will not make an award at a price premium that it considers disproportionate to the benefits associated with the evaluated superiority of one proposal over another.

The relative importance of the criteria are as follows: Criterion 1 and Criterion 2 are of equal importance. Criterion 3 is of less importance than Criterion 1 or Criterion 2. Criterion 4 is of less importance than Criterion 3. Criterion 1 and Criterion 2 combined are significantly more important than Criterion 3 and Criterion 4 combined.

M.4 EMCBC-M-1004 Technical Evaluation

Evaluation Criteria 1 through 4 constitute the Evaluation Criteria for the Technical Proposal. Corresponding proposal preparation instructions are in Section L. The technical proposal will not be point scored, but will be adjectivally rated and evaluated in accordance with the following criteria:

(1) Criterion 1 – Relevant Experience

DOE will evaluate each Offeror, any subcontractor, and in the case of a newly formed entity, each member's corporate experience in performing relevant work completed within the last five (5) years or currently ongoing which is similar in size, scope and complexity to that described in the PWS. Size is defined as dollar value and duration (NOTE: Work performed with values ranging from \$250K to \$10M and durations of 2 to 4 years and/or work being performed or that has been performed under two or more contracts/projects concurrently is considered to be relevant). Scope is defined as the type of work that is the same or similar to that identified in the PWS. Complexity is defined as performance challenges (planning and conducting environmental characterization programs that involve radionuclide contamination, managing and disseminating large amounts of field-collected data within very tight schedule constraints (e.g., 24 hour turn-around).

DOE will evaluate the experience of the Offeror and any subcontractors, or in the case of a newly formed entity, each member, with respect to the type of work proposed and commensurate with the portion of the overall work being performed by each entity. The DOE will evaluate the depth and breadth of the Offeror, any subcontractors, and if a joint venture or a newly formed entity, each member's role in the management and execution of the experience cited. If the Offeror is a newly formed entity, the experience of the parent organizations or LLC members will be evaluated with respect to the type of work proposed and commensurate with the portion of the work to be performed by each entity.

(2) Criterion 2 - Technical and Management Approach (Sample Task)

The Offeror's approach will be evaluated to determine the Offeror's understanding of and ability to perform the Sample Task. The DOE will evaluate the technical approach to safely and effectively perform the Sample Task in accordance with the requirements of the Sample task. The DOE will consider the following in the evaluation of the overall approach to the Sample Task:

- Approach to Management and Execute Sample Task Requirements
- Approach to Environmental Safety Health & Quality Assurance
- Planned Organizational Structure to Perform Sample Task

- Approach to Risk Management
- Schedule, sequence of activities and milestones, including integration of the DOE and regulator reviews
- Any technical innovations that will enhance the work.

(3) Criterion 3 –Key Personnel & Staffing

The DOE will evaluate the Key Personnel and Staffing of the Offeror. The DOE will evaluate the following:

Approach to obtain and provide qualified management personnel for performance of the Task Orders over the period of performance of the contract in the following positions at a minimum: Environmental, Safety, Health and Quality Manager and Analytical Services Laboratory Manager.

- Approach to obtain and provide qualified technical personnel for performance of the Task Orders over the period of performance of the contract in the following positions: Environmental Monitoring Technicians, Instrumentation Technician, Radiological Controls Technicians, and Safety and Health Technicians.
- Plan to staff the teams for Task Orders including the resources and expertise to assist in resolution of technical issues/problems and the integration of teaming partners/ subcontractors into a cohesive organization.
- DOE will assess what level of contract performance support it can expect from the Offeror's corporate capability and the ease and frequency of its expected usage. This will focus on corporate governance, routine corporate oversight, and the level of corporate involvement in contract execution."

(4) Criterion 4 – Relevant Past Performance

The Offeror's and its subcontractors' past performance will be evaluated on the basis of information furnished by its customers and other sources on relevant contracts (including current contracts) that are similar in size, scope and complexity to the work described in the Performance Work Statement. The Government will consider in its evaluation the relevance and similarity of the Offeror's past performance information, the Offeror's written discussion of past performance problems, and the corrective actions taken to resolve those problems. The Government will consider past performance information in areas of environment, safety and health (ES&H). In the case of a newly formed joint venture or LLC, DOE will evaluate the past performance of each member that comprises the newly formed entity commensurate with the portion of the work being performed by each entity.

The Past Performance Reference Information Form, ES&H Past Performance Form, and Past Performance Questionnaire identified in Section L will be used to collect this information. DOE may evaluate past performance on less than the total number of contracts if all the completed questionnaires are not returned.

DOE may solicit past performance information from available sources, including references and clients identified by the Offeror, and will consider such information in its evaluation. References other than those identified by the Offeror may be contacted and be considered by the Government regarding the evaluation of the Offeror's past performance. DOE will check Federal Government electronic databases for relevant past performance information. DOE may check readily available Government records including pertinent DOE prime contracts, or from commercial references for relevant past performance information. DOE will review all information submitted, may contact some or all of the contract references provided by the Offeror, and may contact references other than those identified by the Offeror.

Offerors without a record of relevant past performance on contracts that are similar in size, scope and complexity, or for whom past performance is not available, will be evaluated neither favorably nor

unfavorably on past performance.

M.5 EMCBC-M-1005 Cost Evaluation

DOE will evaluate each Offeror's proposed cost for the Sample Task using one or more of the techniques defined in FAR 15.404, in order to determine if the proposed costs are reasonable, realistic, and complete. The government will evaluate the realism of each Offeror's proposed costs. The evaluation of cost realism includes an analysis of specific elements of each Offeror's proposed cost to determine whether the proposed estimated cost elements are sufficient for the work to be performed; reflect a clear understanding of the requirements; and are consistent with the methods of performance and materials described in the Offeror's technical proposal.

The cost proposal will not be point scored or adjectively rated but will be evaluated for consistency with the Technical Proposal and will be used in determining which proposal represents the best value to the Government.

For evaluation purposes, DOE will compute the most probable cost associated with the Offeror's proposal. The total evaluated price is the Government-determined most probable cost plus the proposed fee ceiling for cost plus award fee in Section B.2.

Evaluated Fee Ceilings: DOE will evaluate the base fee, fixed fee and award fee ceilings proposed as part of its best value determination in accordance with the following:

The proposed fee ceilings will not be point scored or adjectively rated but will be evaluated for consistency and reasonableness and commensurate with the risk for the type of work to be required under this contract. The proposed fee ceilings will be used in determining which proposal represents the best value to the Government. The cost plus award fee ceiling will be included as part of the total evaluated price for the sample task. The fixed fee proposed will be evaluated separately in accordance with the above regarding consistency and commensurateness. Offerors that propose a fixed fee that exceeds the statutory limitation specified in FAR 15.404(c)(4)(i) may be ineligible for award.